

Remarks

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on March 21, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-2, 8-11, and 16 are amended; as a result, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application. These claim amendments are supported by the original filed specification and no new matter has been introduced. Thus, the entry of these amendments is appropriate.

'103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoover (U.S. 5,560,005). It is of course fundamental that each and every element of rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited references. Hoover fails to teach or suggest a table schema in the manner recited in Applicant's amended claims. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 1-20 are no longer sustainable.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the object broker in Hoover, which is used to join heterogeneous fields of tables, is the table of Applicant's independent claims. However, Applicant disagrees with this conclusion, because the teachings of Hoover are designed to not modify a table of a database, rather, in Hoover yet another software module (the object broker) is created to provide database integration. In doing this, Hoover must maintain elaborate synchronization and locking mechanisms within its object broker and has yet another software module to maintain. Conversely, Applicant's independent claims utilize and modify a single table having a generic schema when integration is desired. This is not obvious, because Hoover did not know how to achieve this and elected to avoid modifying existing tables and schemas of tables and rather elected to create a separate object broker in its effort to provide database field integration.

The object broker in Hoover does not receive a table having a table schema; rather, in Hoover pointers to a plurality of tables are received in its object broker. Additionally, in Hoover, values are inserted into the object broker and not into the received table as is recited in Applicant's amended claims. This further illustrates the point that Hoover did not want to modify any received tables because of the differing table schemas that Hoover did not want to have to address. Thus, Hoover elected and taught that values were maintained and stored in the

object broker that it developed. But, Hoover cannot teach and does not suggest how different values can be inserted into a single field of the received table pointers.

Next, the Examiner appears to assert that the Keyword is in fact a table; Applicant's disagree with this conclusion. The Examiner asserts that in Hoover the person label is the identification field and the provider field is the keyword field. But, the provider field is actually the pointers to the external tables having different table schemas that the object table is integrating. This is not a keyword field; the provider field label is the tables being integrated in Hoover. Hoover does not teach or even remotely suggest how a keyword field of a received table pointer can include two separate values within the received table pointer.

In fact, Hoover and Applicant's amended independent claims take two very different approaches for two dissimilar purposes. Hoover is attempting to integrate disparate databases fields by creating an object broker to manage disparities, whereas Applicant's independent claims are changing the cardinality of the same fields within a single table having a generic schema. Hoover does not affect the cardinality of fields; it rather, affects the integration of disparate fields into a single field with its object broker implementation.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that in Hoover there is no teaching or suggestion of receive a table having a table schema where two separate values for a single keyword field can receive and be associated with those two values, as is recited in Applicant's amended independent claims. Making this change in Hoover is not obvious because Hoover took a different approach and was solving a different problem, namely disparate field names of disparate databases. Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

WAYNE L. HUTCHINSON ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date

8/21/03

By

Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 21st day of August, 2003.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

